



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Finally, we may note that the author failed to observe the relationship that existed between the fifth-century theater at Athens and that of the fourth century, with the result that his reconstruction of the former is certainly wrong, as is also that proposed by Noack (*Σκηνὴ Τραγικὴ*). In spite, however, of these and other questionable hypotheses and proposed reconstructions, *Die altgriechische Bühne* is not without value to the specialist. To others it cannot be recommended.

JAMES TURNER ALLEN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque. 2^e édition revue et corrigée. By A. MEILLET. Paris: Libraire Hachette, 1920. Pp. xv+254.

The appearance of a second edition of Professor Meillet's *Aperçu* indicates that the book has had the wide circulation which it deserves. Such a history of the Greek language, written on broad lines and in a fascinating style, makes an appeal to all concerned with the history of Greek civilization. The new edition, which is printed on a much wider page, is the result of a careful revision in which, as the author states, scarcely a page has remained unchanged. I select a few points for comment.

The chapter on the "Structure du grec commun" describes the phonetic and grammatical innovations of Greek. It would have been of interest to bring together also some of the equally characteristic lexical features, such as the substitution of *εἷς* for the old numeral for "one" (preserved in the sense of "ace," *οἰνῇ*), of *ἀδελφός* and *ἀδελφή* for the old words for "brother" and "sister" (*φράτηρ* preserved in a technical sense), the common use of *ἔχω*, *λαμβάνω*, *βούλομαι*, *ποιέω*, and many other words which, while of IE affinities, play a conspicuously distinctive rôle in the Greek vocabulary. This is entirely apart from that element of the vocabulary which may have come into Greek from the Aegean languages and is discussed by the author in the next chapter.

The chapter "Le grec et les langues voisines" opens with the remark that if we knew what languages were encountered by those who brought with them the Greek language we might attempt to discover what peculiarities of Greek pronunciation and grammar were due to the populations that the Greeks assimilated and what words were taken over from the earlier languages of the region. "Le problème se pose; on n'a pas des données pour le résoudre." But there follows, in a paragraph inserted in the new edition, the emphatic assertion: "Une seule chose est sûre: les innovations qui font que le système grec diffère essentiellement du système indo-européen supposent des tendances bien distinctes de celles qui caractérisaient l'indo-européen, et, par suite, l'action de populations indigènes avec lesquelles se

sont mélangés les envahisseurs de langue indo-européenne. En passant de l'indo-européen au grec commun, on entre dans un monde nouveau." Is it so certain that the divergence of Greek from the parent speech must be due to the non-Indo-European speech tendencies of the indigenous populations? I fail to see that the prehistoric changes involved therein are more fundamental than changes that have occurred in the historical period of say Greek or of English, without appreciable external influence except in vocabulary. I am not denying that the influence of an alien substratum is one of the possible factors in phonetic and morphological change. But I believe that its scope is greatly exaggerated nowadays by perhaps the majority of linguistic scholars,¹ some of whom make it the prime and almost universal factor (whereas it is often obviously inapplicable, as in the case of the sweeping vowel-shift in English since Chaucer's time). The instances in which the doctrine is supported by tangible evidence are few in number compared to those cases in which it is only a convenient hypothesis, the supposed influence of a linguistic substratum of which one has no scrap of actual knowledge. Furthermore, as Professor Meillet himself remarks in a later passage (p. 39), "la même où l'on a sur les populations antérieures à l'installation d'une nouvelle langue dans une région des données précises, on n'arrive guère à déterminer en quoi la substitution d'un idiome à un autre a commandé l'évolution ultérieure. Les romanistes ne sont pas arrivés à se mettre d'accord sur ce que la forme prise en Gaule par le latin peut devoir à l'influence gauloise, et tel romaniste éminent va jusqu'à dénier presque toute action au gaulois sur le développement de la prononciation ou de la grammaire du gallo-roman." Yet it is in just this field, comparatively favorable for demonstration, since something is known of the Celtic of Gaul, that the whole theory was started by Ascoli. After all, it is only the influence of the indigenous languages on the Greek vocabulary that the author elaborates in the course of the chapter, and of such influence there can be no reasonable doubt.

Page 57. The substitution of $-\tau\eta\varsigma$ ($-\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$) for $-\tau\eta\rho$ in agent-nouns has no doubt gone farther in Attic-Ionic than elsewhere. But $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, which is mentioned as Arcadian also, occurs likewise in Cretan, from the time of the earliest records, and in other Doric dialects. In connection with the survival of $-\tau\eta\rho$ in Attic-Ionic in special cases like $\sigma\omega\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, one might have added the class of words denoting concrete objects, utensils, etc., which were no longer felt as agent-nouns, e.g., $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ "mixer, bowl," $\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, etc.

Pages 63, 64. Lesbian and Thessalian $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon$ (= $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon$), which is not mentioned, shows that the Aeolic labial instead of usual dental from IE labio-velar before ϵ is not restricted to the initial position; and Hom. $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\upsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma$, which is later (p. 123) quoted among the Aeolisms of Homer shows that it

¹ Against such exaggeration, cf. Jespersen, *Phonetische Grundfragen* 178; Pusçariu *Z. f. rom. Phil.* Beiheft 26, 46 ff.

may occur before ι . Neither the author's nor any of the other attempts to formulate the precise conditions has proved satisfactory.

I am frequently at variance with the author's judgment regarding the significance for the dialect relations of this or that particular point of agreement, and I cannot wholly accept the principle (which he has also laid down elsewhere, as in his attack on the unity of Balto-Slavic) that only the innovations count and that even a whole series of points of agreement in conservation, such as are many, though not all, the characteristics common to the "occidental" or West-Greek group, is strictly without weight. But it would take too much space to discuss these matters here, in which, moreover, a certain degree of subjectivity is inevitable. No essential disagreement as to the classification of the dialects is involved.

Probably the majority of classical readers will be most appreciative of the second and third parts with the clear-cut descriptions of the literary dialects and the evolution and later history of the *κοινή*.

C. D. BUCK

M. Tulli Ciceronis de Divinatione Liber Primus. With a commentary by ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE. Parts I and II. "University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature." Vol. VI, Nos. 2 and 3. Published by the University of Illinois.

Professor Pease has done a great service to scholarship in providing what was hitherto lacking—an edition of the *De divinatione* that could take its place beside the adequate English and German editions of Cicero's other philosophical works. Students of ancient philosophy and religion, whether they accept all of Professor Pease's conclusions or not, may consult him with the confidence that they will not be put off with vagueness or evasion but will find all difficulties thoughtfully examined with abundant reference to the modern literature of the subject—German, French, English and, it is pleasant to add, American. The notes are mainly exegetical, text criticism being usually limited to explanations of the deviations from the Teubner edition of 1878 or readings unsupported by any of the MSS of the C group. The full notes emphasize chiefly the history of philosophic ideas, religion, religious antiquities, and, I regret to say, folklore. But they do not neglect questions of Latin usage or Ciceronian criticism and style. Especially interesting are the copious annotations of the fragments of Ciceronian and other early Latin verse.

The introduction presents a good account of the relation of the treatise to Cicero's other philosophical works, a sketch of its influence on subsequent literature, and a summary of German theories as to Cicero's sources in which Posidonius, of course, is prominent. Of this line of inquiry I can only say in Cicero's own words, "quis negat . . . disciplinam esse?"